

September 15, 2003

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**LOCAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 03-113-(4)
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 03-113-(4)
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 03-113-(4)
PETITIONER: HACIENDA SENIOR PARTNERS, L.P.
2350 HYPERION AVENUE
HACIENDA HEIGHTS ZONED DISTRICT
FOURTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Adopt the attached resolution amending the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan (Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4)) as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission.
2. Adopt the attached ordinance, approved as to form by County Counsel, to change zones within the Hacienda Heights Zoned District as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission (Zone Change No. 03-113-(4)).
3. Consider the Negative Declaration for Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4), Zone Change No. 03-113-(4), and Conditional Use Permit No. 03-113-(4), together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
4. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the necessary findings to affirm the Regional Planning Commission's approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 03-113-(4).

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

- Update the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan Land Use Policy map to reflect current conditions for the Hacienda Heights area.

- Establish development standards that ensure future development on the subject property will be compatible with the goals and policies of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This local plan amendment, zone change and conditional use permit promotes the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence. The project components (plan amendment, zone change and conditional use permit) were carefully researched and analyzed to ensure that quality information regarding the subject property is available.

This local plan amendment, zone change and conditional use permit also promotes the County's vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The approval of this development will provide 75 apartment units to be made available for senior citizens, fulfilling a housing need in Los Angeles County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementation of the proposed zone change, adoption of the plan amendment as part of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan, and approval of the conditional use permit should not result in any new significant costs to the County or to the Department of Regional Planning; no request for financing is being made.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The proposed plan amendment will update the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan Policy Map to reflect the most current conditions in the area. This ensures that the Plan will continue to serve as a current reflection of the goals and policies of the Hacienda Heights community.

The Regional Planning Commission conducted concurrent public hearings on Local Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit Case Nos. 03-113-(4) on August 27, 2003. The three requests before the Commission were: 1) a local plan amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community Plan from the "Urban 4" classification to the "Urban 5" classification, 2) a zone change from the existing R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP on 1.77 acres, and 4) a conditional use permit to develop the site with a two to three-story 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex. The Regional Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the requested local plan amendment and zone change, and to approve conditional use permit at their September 10, 2003 meeting.

Pursuant to subsection B.2 of Section 22.60.230 of the County Code, the conditional use permit approved by the Regional Planning Commission is deemed to be called for review by your Board and shall be considered concurrently with the recommended local plan amendment and zone change. A public hearing is required pursuant to Sections 22.16.200 and 22.60.240 of the County Code and Sections 65335 and 65856 of the Government

Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65355 and 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The proposed plan amendment, zone change, and conditional use permit will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.

Based on the Negative Declaration, adoption of the proposed plan amendment and zone change and approval of the conditional use permit will not have a significant effect on the environment.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES OR (OR PROJECTS)

Action on the proposed plan amendment, zone change and conditional use permit is not anticipated to have a negative impact on current services.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Frank Menses, Acting Administrator
Current Planning Division

FM:RJF:SD

Attachments: Commission Resolutions, Commission Findings & Conditions,
Commission Staff Report & Attachments, Zone Change Ordinance &
Map, Local Plan Amendment Resolution & Map

C: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Assessor
Director, Department of Public Works

RESOLUTION
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOCAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-113-(4)

WHEREAS, Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with Section 65350) provides for the adoption of amendments to county general plans; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) on _____; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, having considered the recommendations of the Regional Planning Commission, finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting a Local Plan Amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan to change land use designation from U4 (Urban 4 – 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) to U5 (Urban 5 – 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units) on 1.77 acres in order to develop a senior citizen apartment complex.
2. The local plan amendment request was heard concurrently with Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-114-(4) at a public hearing before the Regional Planning Commission on August 27, 2003. The Commission received oral and written testimony regarding the request.
3. Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) is related to authorize a change of zone from R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP on the 1.77-acre subject parcel. The addition of the DP (Development Program) component in the proposed zoning will assure that development occurring after the property has been rezoned will conform to plans submitted by the applicant through the conditional use permit approval process.
4. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) is a related request to authorize the development of a 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex with a 22-unit density bonus and concessions and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Development Program zone.
5. The subject property is a 1.77-acre parcel located at 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District. The rectangular-shaped subject property is currently vacant with level terrain.

6. The site plan for the conditional use permit site plan, labeled Exhibit "A", shows a 1.77 acre rectangular-shaped parcel developed with a two to three-story, seventy-five (75) unit senior citizen apartment complex with a community room and an office area located on the first floor. The proposed structure consists of seventy-four (74) one-bedroom units and one (1) two-bedroom manager's unit. The applicant is proposing to provide two laundry facilities on each floor of the building and 55 uncovered parking spaces (52 standard and 3 handicapped). The required parking is 48 spaces. The parking area is depicted at the rear and along the west side of the subject property.
7. The subject property is currently depicted within the Urban 4 (U4, Medium-High Density Residential) land use classification in the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan (HHCGP). The HHCGP describes areas designated as Urban 4 as multiple residential developments within urbanized areas with a density range of 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre. The proposed apartment complex is inconsistent with the U4 land use category of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan.
8. The proposed plan amendment is compatible with the goals and policies of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan and the Countywide General Plan in that the Community Plan states that a major housing issue in that community is the lack of a broad variety of housing types and prices for all segments of the population. The Plan states that each community is charged with providing housing for all segments of the population including those who do not now live there but who should be given an opportunity to do so. The Plan further states that each community has a responsibility to provide housing for low income persons. The HHCGP's housing element encourages the development of incentives and subsidies for low income housing in the community.
9. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
10. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the proposed Local Plan Amendment will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles:

1. Considers the Negative Declaration that was prepared for Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4) together with any comments received during the public review process, certifies that it has been completed in compliance with the CEQA and the State and County guidelines related thereto, finds on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the County, and adopts the Negative Declaration.
2. Determines that Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4) is consistent with the goals, policies and program of the County General Plan, including the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan.
3. Adopts Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4) amending the Land Use Policy Map of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan as shown on the map attached to this resolution.

The foregoing resolution was on the _____ day of October 28, 2003, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies and authorities for which Board so acts.

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS, Executive Officer-

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of
the County of Los Angeles

By _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM
BY COUNTY COUNSEL

LLOYD W. PELLMAN

By _____
Deputy

**THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOCAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 03-113-(4)**

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) on August 27, 2003; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting a Local Plan Amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan to change the land use designation from U4 (Urban 4 – 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) to U5 (Urban 5 – 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units) on 1.77 acres in order to develop a senior citizen apartment complex.
2. The local plan amendment request was heard concurrently with Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) at a public hearing before the Regional Planning Commission on August 27, 2003. The Commission received oral and written testimony regarding the request.
3. Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) is a related request to authorize a change of zone from R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP on the 1.77-acre subject parcel. The DP (Development Program) component in the proposed zoning assures that development occurring after the property has been rezoned will conform to plans submitted by the applicant through the conditional use permit approval process.
4. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) is a related request to authorize the development of a 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex with a 22-unit density bonus and concessions and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Development Program zone.
5. The subject property is a 1.77-acre parcel located at 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District. The rectangular-shaped subject property is currently vacant with level terrain.
6. The site plan for the conditional use permit, labeled Exhibit “A”, shows a 1.77 acre rectangular-shaped parcel developed with a two to three-story, seventy-five (75) unit senior citizen apartment complex with a community room and an office area located on the first floor. The proposed structure consists of seventy-four (74) one-bedroom units and one (1) two-bedroom manager’s unit. The applicant is proposing to provide two laundry facilities on each floor of the building and 55 uncovered parking spaces (52 standard and 3 handicapped). The required parking is 48 spaces. The parking area is depicted at the rear and along the west side of the subject property.

7. The subject property is currently depicted within the Urban 4 (U4, Medium-High Density Residential) land use classification in the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan (HHCGP). The HHCGP describes areas designated as Urban 4 as multiple residential developments within urbanized areas with a density range of 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre. The proposed apartment complex is inconsistent with the U4 land use category of the Hacienda Heights Community Plan.
8. The proposed plan amendment is compatible with the goals and policies of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan and the Countywide General Plan in that the Community Plan states that a major housing issue in that community is the lack of a broad variety of housing types and prices for all segments of the population. The Plan states that each community is charged with providing housing for all segments of the population including those who do not now live there but who should be given an opportunity to do so. The Plan further states that each community has a responsibility to provide housing for low income persons. The HHCGP's housing element encourages the development of incentives and subsidies for low income housing in the community.
9. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
10. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the proposed Local Plan Amendment will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends to the Board of Supervisors as follows:

1. That the Board of Supervisors hold a public hearing to consider Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4), a change of land use classification within the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan from Urban 4 to Urban 5 on 1.77 acres;
2. That the Board of Supervisors certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration and determine that Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-114-(4) will not have a significant impact upon the environment;

3. That the Board of Supervisors find that Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan, including the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan; and
4. That the Board of Supervisors adopt recommended Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4), changing the land use designation on the property as depicted on the attached Exhibit and described hereinabove.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on **September 10, 2003**.

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission

**THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 03-113-(4)**

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) on August 27, 2003; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting a change of zone from R-2-DP (Two-family Residential-Development Program) to R-3-30U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-30 Units Per Acre-Development Program) on a 1.77 acre parcel. The DP-Development Program will assure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to the approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied to this case, the conditional use permit will restrict the development of the re-zoned site to a 75-unit apartment building for senior citizens as shown on the site plan marked Exhibit "A." No other development is permitted on the property unless a new conditional use permit is obtained.
2. The subject property is a 1.77-acre parcel located at 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District. The rectangular shape subject property is currently vacant with level terrain.
3. The zone change request was heard concurrently with Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) at the August 27, 2003 public hearing. The Commission received oral and written testimony regarding the request.
4. Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) is a related request to authorize the change of land use classification in the Hacienda Heights Community Plan from U4 to U5 on the subject property.
5. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) is a related request to authorize the development of a 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex with a 22-unit density bonus and concessions and a setback modification, and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Development Program zone.
6. The site plan for the conditional use permit, labeled Exhibit "A", shows a 1.77 acre rectangular-shaped parcel developed with a two to three-story, seventy-five (75) unit senior citizen apartment complex with a community room and an office area located on the first floor. The proposed structure consists of seventy-four (74) one-bedroom units and one (1) two-bedroom manager's unit. The applicant is

proposing to provide two laundry facilities on each floor of the building and 55 uncovered parking spaces (52 standard and 3 handicapped). The required parking is 48 spaces. The parking area is depicted at the rear and along the west side of the subject property.

7. The subject property is currently zoned R-2-DP, which would allow a maximum of 48 units with approved Conditional Use Permit No. 98-281-(4). The proposed 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex is inconsistent with the current zoning of the property. The R-3 zoning is required to develop the parcel with the density as proposed.
8. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning of the subject property due to escalating home prices and increased demand for affordable rental housing. The proposed development will increase the supply of affordable housing and relieve the housing shortage in the region.
9. A need exists for the proposed Zone Change from R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP to provide needed housing for senior citizens in the Hacienda Heights community and provide identifiable cost reductions and incentives for private sector participation in providing affordable housing.
10. The subject property is a proper location for the proposed R-3-30U-DP zoning classification and placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good zoning practice because the properties to the east have been developed with commercial uses and properties to the west and south have been developed with single-family residences; the development of an apartment unit on the subject property will serve as a buffer between the commercial and residential uses. Moreover, the proposed zoning classification is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide General Plan and the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan.
11. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Commission, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
12. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the proposed change of zone will have a significant effect on the

environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4), a proposed change of zone from R-2-DP (Two-family Residential, Development Program) to R-3-30U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-30 Units Per Acre-Development Program) on 1.77 acres, with development restrictions as provided by the related Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4);
2. Certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration and determine that Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4) will not have a significant impact upon the environment.
3. Find that the recommended zoning is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan, including the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan, with the adoption by the Board of Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4).
4. Find that the public convenience, the general welfare and good zoning practice justify the recommended change of zone.
5. Adopt recommended Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4), changing the zoning classification on the property as depicted on the attached Exhibit and described hereinabove.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on **September 10, 2003**.

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission

September 15, 2003

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Hacienda Senior Partners, L.P.
2350 Hyperion Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90027

RE: ZONE CHANGE, LOCAL PLAN AMENDMENT, & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO.
03-113-(4)
15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights

Dear Applicant:

PLEASE NOTE: This document contains the Regional Planning Commission's findings and conditions relating to **APPROVAL** of the above referenced Conditional Use Permit as well as their recommendation for **APPROVAL** to the Board of Supervisors of the related zone change and plan amendment.

Your attention is called to condition number 3 of the Conditional Use Permit which states that this grant shall not become effective until the Board of Supervisors has adopted the zone change and plan amendment submitted concurrently with this application.

Pursuant to Section 22.60.230, subsection B.2, when the Regional Planning Commission makes a recommendation on a legislative action concurrently with approval of a nonlegislative land use application, the Board of Supervisors shall call the nonlegislative application up for concurrent review. Please be advised that this may result in modification of the findings and/or conditions attached hereto.

Payment of fees required by the conditions of approval will not be accepted until the Board of Supervisors has approved the zone change and the plan amendment.

Very truly yours,

Department of Regional Planning
James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

Russell J. Fricano, Ph.D., AICP
Acting Section Head
Zoning Permits Section I

RJF:SD

Enclosures: Findings and Conditions

c: Board of Supervisors, Department of Public Works (Building and Safety), Department of Public Works (Subdivision Mapping), Zoning Enforcement and Sharon Pluth

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 03-113-(4)

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE: AUGUST 27, 2003

SYNOPSIS:

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to authorize the development of the 1.77-acre site with a two to three-story 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex, including a 22-unit density bonus. The applicant is proposing to construct seventy-four (74) one-bedroom units and one (1) two-bedroom manager unit. No project phasing is proposed. Grading is proposed to be limited to finish grading only with no import or export of soils from the site.

The applicant is concurrently requesting a Local Plan Amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan land use designation from Urban 4 (U4, Medium High Density, 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) to Urban 5 (U5, High Density Residential, 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units per acre) on 1.77 acres.

The applicant is also concurrently requesting a change of zone from R-2-DP (Two-family Residential- Development Program) to R-3-30U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-30 units per acre-Development Program) on the 1.77-acre parcel. The Development Program (DP) component in the proposed zoning assures that development occurring after the property has been rezoned will conform to plans submitted by the applicant through the conditional use permit approval process.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSION

August 27, 2003 Public Hearing

The scheduled public hearing was continued from August 6, 2003, August 13, 2003, and August 20, 2003 to August 27, 2003, due to lack of a quorum. On August 27, 2003, a duly noticed public hearing was held before the Planning Commission. Commissioner Rew and Commissioner Valadez were absent. The two applicants testified in favor of the project in and no one testify in opposition to the request. The applicant requested that the Commission consider waiving the Department of Public Works' recommendation to require installation of street lights due to the installation cost and time needed to annex the required streets into the Lighting District. The Department of Public Works indicated that the street lights are needed for the subject property since there are no street lights fronting on the subject property and has recommended that the requested waiver be denied.

There being no further testimony, and after discussion, the Regional Planning Commission voted (3-0) to close the public hearing, indicate its intent to approve the conditional use permit, and instruct staff to prepare the final environmental document and findings and conditions for approval.

Findings

- 1 The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to develop a 75-unit senior citizen apartment complex with a density bonus and concessions for affordable housing pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.56.202 of the Los Angeles County Code, and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the proposed Development Program zone pursuant to Sections 22.20.260 and 22.40.040. The applicant is also requesting a modification to the required setback for fencing pursuant to Section 22.48.180 of the County Code.
- 2 The subject property is located at 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District. The subject property is currently vacant.
- 3 The rectangular shaped project site is relatively flat and is 1.77 acres in size. Access to the parcel is via Gale Avenue to the north.
- 4 Zoning on the subject property is R-2-DP (Two Family Residential-Development Program). Concurrent with this approval, however, the Commission is recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4). If approved by the Board of Supervisors, the project site will be zoned R-3-30U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-30 Unit per Acre-Development Program).
- 5 Zoning surrounding the subject property consists of City of Industry zoning to the north, A-1-6,000 to the south, and C-2-BE and A-1-6,000 to the east and west. Surrounding land uses include commercial uses to the north and east and single-family residences to the south and west.
- 6 Apartment houses are permitted in the R-3 zone pursuant to Section 22.20.260 of the County Code and, pursuant to County Code Section 22.40.040, property in a DP zone may be used for any use permitted in the basic zone, subject to the conditions and limitations of a conditional use permit and approved development program contained therein. The proposed project is consistent with the proposed R-3-30U-DP zoning classification.
- 7 The subject property is depicted within the Urban 4 land use classification in the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan. The Urban 4 land use category permits multiple residential developments within urbanized areas with a density range of 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre. Concurrent with this approval, however, the Commission is recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4). If approved by the Board of Supervisors, the subject property's land use designation will be changed from Urban 4 (U4, Medium-High Density with an allowable density ranging from 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre) to Urban 5 (U5, High Density with an allowable density ranging from 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units per gross acre). The Urban 5 land use category permits high density residential development characterized by medium and high rise apartments with a density range of 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units per gross acre.

- 8 A density of 30 dwelling units per acre (53 dwelling units) is proposed for the subject property before consideration of the requested density bonus. This density is consistent with the density allowed in the Urban 5 land use classification.
- 9 The Hacienda Heights Community General Plan provides that one of the major housing issues in this community is the lack of a broad variety of housing types and prices. The Plan states that each community is charged with providing housing for all segments of the population including those who do not now live there but who should be given an opportunity to do so.
- 10 The Countywide General Plan supports the provision of critically needed low and moderate income housing through the development and application of density bonus and other programs designed to stimulate production of such housing by both public and private sectors. The policies of the Plan encourage private sector participation in the development of a variety of affordable and special needs housing for both rental and home ownership.
- 11 The Commission finds that the proposed senior citizen housing development is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide General Plan and the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan.
- 12 The applicant's site plan, labeled as "Exhibit A," shows a 1.77 acre rectangular-shaped parcel developed with a three-story, seventy-five (75) unit senior citizen apartment complex with a community room and office area located on the first floor. The site plan depicts fifty-five (55) uncovered parking spaces (52 standard spaces and 3 spaces accessible to disabled persons) and appurtenant landscaping. Access is provided by a 26-foot wide driveway from Gale Avenue along the west side of the property.
- 13 The proposed use is subject to the development standards and requirements applicable to the R-3 zone, as set forth in Sections 22.20.260 through 22.20.330 of the County Code, as well as the requirements of the DP zone, pursuant to Sections 22.40.030 through 22.40.080 of the County Code.
- 14 Pursuant to Section 22.20.300 of the County Code, no building or structure in the R-3 zone shall have a height in excess of 35 feet above grade, except chimneys and rooftop antennae. The applicant is proposing a two-story design element at the front and rear of the complex; the proposed development was designed with a maximum allowable height of 35' -0" above grade which is consistent with the maximum allowable height of the R-3 zone.
- 15 Section 22.20.310 of the County Code provides that property developed for any residential use in Zone R-3-30U shall not exceed 30 units per net acre. Before applying the requested density bonus, the project consists of 53 units on 1.77 acres, which complies with the maximum density applicable to the property.

- 16 Section 22.20.320 of the County Code requires a front yard setback of not less than 15 feet, interior side yard setbacks of not less than five feet, and rear yard setbacks of not less than fifteen feet on properties in the R-3 zone. The applicant's site plan depicts the apartment units set back from the front property line 20 feet, minimum interior side yard setbacks of 10 and 75 feet, and a minimum rear yard setback of 74 feet. The applicant's site plan is in compliance with the setback requirements of the R-3 zone.
- 17 Sections 22.20.320 and 22.48.160 of the County Code provide that in the R-3 zone, fences and walls within the required 15-foot front yard setback shall not exceed a height of 3'6". The applicant is proposing a six-foot high masonry wall/fence along the south, east, and west property lines and four-foot high wrought iron fencing and masonry wall along the north property line. Pursuant to Section 22.48.180, the applicant has requested a modification to the 3'6" height limit to allow the proposed 6-foot wall/fence along Gale Avenue. The Regional Planning Commission finds that the shape and configuration of the subject property makes it obviously impractical to require compliance and grants the modification as requested.
- 18 Section 22.20.330 of the County Code requires parking to be provided as required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52 of the County Code. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1210 of Part 11, one-half parking space shall be provided for each dwelling unit, subject to the following restrictions:
 - a. The parking may be covered or uncovered; if uncovered, the screening requirements of subsection L of Section 22.56.1110 must be followed.
 - b. A deed restriction, covenant or similar document shall be recorded to assure that the occupancy of the units is restricted to senior citizens or handicapped persons.
 - c. A plot plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Director in accordance with Part 12 of Chapter 22.56.
 - d. Guest parking shall be provided in the ratio of one parking space for each eight units. These spaces shall be marked as guest spaces.
- 19 The proposed development, with the attached conditions, will comply with the above parking requirements. A total of 48 parking spaces are required for the proposed development. The applicant's site plan depicts 55 uncovered parking spaces (52 standard spaces and 3 spaces accessible to disabled persons, one of which is van-accessible with a 5-foot load area). The rear parking area will be screened by a six-foot high solid wall that is proposed along the rear property line that meets the screening requirements of subsection L of Section 22.56.1110. As a condition of approval, the applicant will be required to record a deed restriction or similar document to assure that the occupancy of the rental units will be restricted to senior citizens as defined in Title 22 of the County Code (not more than 10 percent of the occupants may be under 62 years of age).

15. The applicant has submitted a development program, consisting of a site plan and progress schedule, which complies with the requirements of Section 22.40.050 of the County Code.
16. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to comply with all applicable development program conditions as set forth in Section 22.40.070.
17. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to comply with all applicable density bonus conditions as set forth in Section 22.56.202.
18. The applicant met with the Hacienda Heights Improvement Association to discuss the project and to answer any questions regarding the proposal. Subsequent to that meeting, the Hacienda Heights Improvement Association forwarded correspondences to the Department of Regional Planning expressing its concerns regarding impacts of the project. The applicant has addressed the Association's concerns through project design and conditions.
19. A community meeting was held by the applicant on July 24, 2003 to address any concerns the surrounding residents might have regarding the proposed development. Five adjacent residents attended the meeting and their concerns regarding drainage and design issues relating to the development were addressed by the applicant. Correspondence has been received from thirteen (13) surrounding residents expressing support for the proposed development.
20. Correspondence has been received from a nearby resident opposing the project. The resident indicated that the proposed project should be denied because the project density is too high, the proposed use and design is out of character to adjacent uses and traffic impacts were not addressed.
21. Pursuant to Section 22.56.202 of the County Code, a density bonus may be requested if the development contains five or more dwelling units and at least 50 percent of the dwelling units are provided for qualifying residents or senior citizens as defined in Sections 51.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code. If the project meets these minimum requirements, a density bonus of at least 25 percent shall be granted. If a project exceeds the minimum requirements, additional bonuses are authorized at a rate of one dwelling unit for each additional senior citizen or qualified resident dwelling unit reserved beyond the minimum required. In no case, however, shall the total density bonus exceed a 50% increase over what the general plan would otherwise allow.
22. The applicant is proposing to reserve all of the proposed dwelling units, with the exception of the manager's unit, for low to very low income senior citizens for at least 30 years. The applicant is requesting a 22-unit density bonus for a total of 75 dwelling units. The proposed project qualifies for the requested density bonus of 22 units.

23. Pursuant to Section 22.56.202 of the County Code, the applicant has requested case expediting and a waiver of case processing fees, and has submitted financial information supporting the need for the concessions requested and the reasons why they are necessary to make the affordable housing units economically feasible.
24. The Commission finds that the proposed development will serve as a buffer between the commercial uses to the east and the single-family homes located to the west and south.
25. The proposed development will not adversely impact local traffic conditions. Gale Avenue will provide access to the proposed development. Currently, Gale Avenue is a designated Secondary Highway with a right-of-way width of approximately 80 feet.
26. The subject property is located within a fully developed urbanized area served by sufficient public services and facilities.
27. There are currently waiting lists at all housing facilities within the Hacienda Heights. The proposed development will provide needed affordable housing for senior citizens in the community.
28. The project site is within walking distance to commercial shops and services used by senior citizens, as well as within walking distance to public transportation.
29. The Commission finds that the requested development is sensitive to the adjacent residential developments and is compatible with the surrounding land uses.
30. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for the proposed project.
31. This conditional use permit request was heard concurrently with Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) and Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4). Approval of Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) will not become effective unless and until the Board of Supervisors has approved the proposed plan amendment and adopted an ordinance effecting the proposed change of zone and such ordinance has become effective.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

- A. That the proposed use will be consistent with the adopted general plan for the area as amended by Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4);

- B. With the attached conditions and restrictions, that the requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare;
- C. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22 of the County Code, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area;
- D. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required;
- E. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns, design, and established community character;
- F. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying affordable housing needs, and is viable in terms of continuing availability to meet such housing needs;
- G. That the proposed project will not cause or add to undue concentration of affordable housing units in the surrounding community;
- G. That the proposed project is reasonably proximate to public transit and shopping;
- H. That the requested incentives or concessions are required to make the affordable housing units economically feasible;
- I. That the development program submitted provides necessary safeguards to insure completion of the proposed development by the applicant, forestalling substitution of a lesser type of development contrary to the public convenience, welfare or development needs of the area; and
- J. That topographic feature and other physical limitations make it obviously impractical to require compliance with the requirement that the front yard fencing/wall not exceed a height of three and one-half feet.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Sections 22.40.060, 22.56.090 and 22.56.202, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

1. The Regional Planning Commission has considered the Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, finds on the basis on the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.
2. In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4) is **APPROVED**, subject to the attached conditions and further subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors of Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4) and Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4).

VOTE: 3-0

Concurring: Commissioners Helsley, Bellamy and Modugno

Dissenting: None

Abstaining: None

Absent: Commissioner Rew and Valadez

Action Date: August 27, 2003

RF:SZD

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. This grant authorizes the use of the subject property, located at 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, for a 75-unit affordable senior citizen apartment complex, including a 22-lot density bonus, as depicted on the approved Revised Exhibit "A", subject to all of the following conditions of approval.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 9 and 10. Further, this grant shall not become effective unless and until the Board of Supervisors has adopted Local Plan Amendment Case No. 03-113-(4) and approved Zone Change Case No. 03-113-(4), and an ordinance effecting the change of zone has become effective.
4. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate fully in the defense.
5. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.
 - b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will

be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code Section 2.170.010.

6. This grant shall expire unless used within 2 years from the date of approval. A one-year time extension may be requested, in writing with the payment of the applicable fee, at least six months before the expiration date.
7. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
8. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.
9. Within fifteen (15) days of the approval of this grant, the permittee shall remit processing fees payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code. The project is not *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife and is not exempt from payment of a fee to the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. The current fee amount is \$1,275.00.
10. The subject property shall be developed, maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions. Prior to the use of this grant, the permittee shall deposit with the County of Los Angeles the sum of **\$3,000.00**. These monies shall be placed in a performance fund which shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department of Regional Planning for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval, including adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The fund provides for **thirty (30) annual inspections**. The inspections shall be unannounced.

If additional inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible for and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. The charge for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment. The current recovery cost is \$150.00 per inspection.

11. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
12. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Division of the Los Angeles County Fire Department to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.
13. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
14. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
15. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the use subject to this grant or that do not provide pertinent information about the premises. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.
16. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.
17. The subject facility shall be developed and maintained in compliance with requirements of the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services. Adequate water and sewage disposal facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of said Department.
18. Within sixty days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three copies of a Revised Exhibit "A", similar to that presented at the public hearing, which clearly shows: 1) the location and type of all proposed wall, bollard, and pole mounted lighting. All lighting shall be hooded and directed away from neighboring residences to prevent direct illumination and glare; 2) the location of five (5) required guest parking spaces; 3) a centrally located stairwell within the apartment complex in addition to the proposed stairwells at the north and south end of the complex; 4) all development program features required by Section 22.40.050.A of the County Code, including the location of all proposed structures and development features including grading, yards, walls, walks, landscaping, height, bulk and arrangement of buildings and structures, signs, the

color and appearance of buildings and structures, and other features as may be needed to make the development attractive, adequately buffered from adjacent more restrictive uses, and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The subject property shall be developed in substantial conformance with the approved Revised Exhibit "A". In the event that subsequent revised plans are submitted, the permittee shall submit three (3) copies of the proposed plans to the Director for review and approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.

19. Within sixty days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three copies of building elevations which depict the proposed colors and materials with fully dimensioned height from grade. The subject property shall be developed in substantial conformance with the approved elevations. In the event that subsequent revised plans are submitted the written authorization of the property owner is necessary.
20. The permittee shall develop the subject parcel with a lawn, shrubbery, flowers and/or trees, which shall be continuously maintained in a neat, clean and healthful condition, including proper pruning, weeding, and removal of litter, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary. Incidental walkways, if needed, may be developed in the landscaped areas. Within sixty days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three copies of a landscape plan, which may be incorporated into the Revised Exhibit "A". The landscape plan shall show the size, type, and location of all plants, trees, and watering facilities. Watering facilities shall consist of "bubblers" or a similar water-efficient irrigation system for irrigation in all areas except where there is turf.
21. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the permittee or his/her successor in interest shall pay a fee to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to the issuance of any building permit in the amount required by Chapter 22.72 at the time of payment and provide proof of payment to the Department of Regional Planning. The current fee amount is \$638.00 per dwelling unit ($\$638.00 \times 75 \text{ dwelling units} = \$47,850.00$). The permittee may contact the County Librarian at (562) 940-8430 regarding payment of fees.
22. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permit, the permittee shall provide documentation to the Director from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District and the local water purveyor that sewer and water facilities are available to serve the subject property.
23. The following development program conditions shall apply:
 - a. No building or structure of any kind except a temporary structure used only in the developing of the property according to the development program shall be built, erected, or moved onto any part of the property;

- b. All improvements shall be completed prior to the occupancy of any structures;
 - c. Where one or more buildings in the projected development are designated as primary buildings, building permits for structures other than those so designated shall not be issued until the foundations have been constructed for such primary building or buildings.
- 24. The construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed senior citizen apartment development shall be further subject to all of the following restrictions:
 - a. All trash containers shall be covered and all trash enclosure areas shall be screened from public and private view corridors and located away from the south and west property lines of the subject property;
 - b. All material graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust during the construction phase. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. All clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e. greater than 20 mph averaged over one hour) to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Any materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust;
 - c. Project construction activity shall be limited to those hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Saturday. All stationary construction noise sources shall be sheltered or enclosed to minimize adverse effects on nearby properties. Generators and pneumatic compressors shall be noise protected in a manner that will minimize noise inconvenience to adjacent residences. Parking of construction worker vehicles shall be on-site and restricted to areas buffered from the residences located to the south and west of the subject property;
 - d. The permittee shall provide and continuously maintain no less than fifty-five (55) on-site standard parking spaces, which may be uncovered (50 for tenant use and five (5) for guest parking), developed to the specifications listed in Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code;
 - e. All rental dwelling units reserved for lower or very low income households shall have an affordable rent as defined in Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code;
 - f. The
 permittee shall submit for review and approval by County Counsel a deed restriction, covenant or similar document running with the land for the benefit of the County of Los Angeles, suitable for recordation in the

office of the County Recorder, to ensure the continuing availability of the affordable housing units for a period of thirty (30) years and to assure that the occupancy of all units, with the exception of the manager's unit, shall be restricted to low income or very low income senior citizens or handicapped persons, as defined in Title 22 of the County Code (not more than 10 percent of the occupants may be under 62 years of age), for a period of thirty (30) years. The document shall contain remedies for violations of the covenant including but not limited to monetary penalties. The approved document shall be recorded prior to the issuance of any building permit;

- g. In the event any units other than the manager's unit are no longer restricted to occupancy by senior citizens, the permittee shall develop the on-site parking spaces needed to bring the use and/or occupancy of the property into conformance with Chapter 22.52 of the County Code.
- h. The maximum height of all buildings and structures is 35 feet above grade, except chimneys and rooftop antennae;
- i. The permittee shall post a sign in English and the predominant second language of the community at the apartment building's primary entrance identifying the manager's name and 24-hour contact telephone number to report any concerns related to the subject property;
- j. Adequate lighting shall be provided and maintained in operable condition in all exterior vehicular and pedestrian areas (e.g. driveways, parking areas, yards, stairways) of the subject property to the satisfaction of the Director. All exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed away from neighboring residences to prevent direct illumination and glare. The primary parking lot lighting shall be turned off no later than 1:00 a.m. A motion activated security lighting system is permitted and may remain on through the night;
- k. The required parking spaces shall be continuously available for vehicular parking only and shall not be used for storage, vehicle repair, or any other unauthorized uses;
- l. The permittee shall submit a parking management plan to the Director for approval before the approval of the Revised Exhibit "A". Said plan shall clearly identify how the permittee intends to assign parking spaces to the apartment's tenants as well as the parking management practices of the facility;
- m. Prior to installation of any signage, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three (3) copies of dimensioned

signage plans depicting all proposed signs, developed in accordance with Part 10 of Chapter 22.52 of the County Code. To increase safety and security measures for the complex, said signs may be internally or externally lighted to the satisfaction of the Director;

- n. Any gate constructed across a driveway shall be designed to County Fire Department specifications so that the entire width of the driveway is accessible by emergency vehicles;
- o. The permittee shall comply with all recommendations and conditions set forth in the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works memoranda dated May 29 and June 2, 2003, except as otherwise modified by said Department;
- p. The permittee shall comply with all recommendations and conditions set forth in the County of Los Angeles Fire Department letter dated June 24, 2003 and August 26, 2003, except as otherwise modified by said Department; and
- q. That the permittee shall comply with all recommendations and conditions set forth in the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services letter dated June 17, 2003, except as otherwise modified by said Department.

Attachments:

County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services letter dated June 17, 2003

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works memoranda dated May 9 and June 2, 2003

County of Los Angeles Fire Department letter dated June 24, 2003

RF:SZD

STAFF ANALYSIS

PROJECT NUMBER

03-113-(4)

CASE NUMBER

Local Plan Amendment/Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-113-(4)

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The applicant, Hacienda Senior Partners, has requested approval of a conditional use permit to develop the 1.77-acre subject property with a 75-unit senior housing complex. The housing complex will be reserved for low and very low income senior citizens. The complex consists of a structure two to three story in height with seventy-four (74) one-bedroom units and one (1) two-bedroom manager unit. The two-story design element is located at the front and rear of the structure. Except for the manager unit, all the units will be reserved as rental housing for low and very low income seniors. The zone change request is to change the zoning of the site from R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP and local plan amendment request is to redesignate the property's land use category from U4 to U5.

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

Location

The subject property is located on the south side of Gale Avenue, between Dunswell Avenue and Farmstead Avenue (15554 Gale Avenue) in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District.

Physical Features

The vacant subject property is a level 1.77-acre rectangular parcel. The property is sparsely vegetated with grass and several trees.

Access

The subject property fronts on Gale Avenue which is a designated Secondary Highway with 80 feet of right-of-way. The applicant proposed to provide a 28-foot wide driveway system to serve the development.

ENTITLEMENT REQUESTED

Local Plan Amendment: The applicant requests approval of an amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan to redesignate the land use category of the subject property from Urban 4 (Medium High Density Residential) to Urban 5 (High Density Residential).

Zone Change: The applicant requests approval of a change of zone from R-2-DP (Two-Family Residence-Development Program) to R-3-30U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-30 Unit Per Acre-Development Program) on the subject property.

Conditional Use Permit: The applicant requests approval of a conditional use permit to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Development Program zone and to authorize a density bonus (22 bonus units over the maximum allowable density of 53

dwelling units per the proposed zoning of R-3-30U-DP) along with setback modification for fencing and accessory structures pursuant to Section 22.48.180 of the County Code. Also, the applicant is requesting waiver of the filling fee and expedited case processing for the proposed development as incentives to provide affordable senior housing.

EXISTING ZONING

Subject Property

Zoning on the subject property is R-2-DP (Two-Family Residence-Development Program).

Surrounding Properties

Surrounding zoning consists of A-1-6,000 to the south, C-2-BE and A-1-6,000 to the east and west. The City of Industry is north of the subject property.

EXISTING LAND USES

Subject Property

The subject property is currently vacant.

Surrounding Properties

Surrounding land uses consist of a warehouse distribution center and industrial developments within the City of Industry to the north; single-family residences to the south; single-family residences, commercial retail and professional office uses to the east and west.

PREVIOUS CASES/ZONING HISTORY

Local Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit Nos. 99-281-(4) were approved by the Regional Planning Commission on August 29, 2001 and adopted by the Board of Supervisor on September 3, 2002. The plan amendment redesignated the land use category of the subject property from Commercial and Urban 2(Low Density Residential) to Urban 4 (Medium High Density Residential). The zone change altered the zoning of the property from C-2-BE (Neighborhood Business-Billboard Exclusion) and A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural-6,000 square feet lot area) to R-2-DP (Two-Family Residence-Development Program). The conditional use permit allowed the development of a 48-unit (including a 26% density bonus) market rate senior citizen apartment complex along with development modifications. The approved development consists of 18 two-bedroom and 30 one-bedroom units.

GENERAL PLAN

The project site is within the Urban 4 (U4, Medium-High Density Residential) land use category of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan (HHCGP). Areas designated as Urban 4 are multiple residential developments within urbanized areas with a density range of 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the redesignate existing Urban 4 category to Urban 5 (U5, High Density Residential). The HHCGP described the areas within the Urban 5 land use category as high density residential development characterized by medium and high rise apartment with a density range of 22.1 to 35.0 dwelling units per gross acre. Pursuant to the High Density Residential land use category (proposed), maximum allowable general plan density on the

1.77-acre subject property is 61.9 or 61 dwelling units. As defined in Section 22.08.040(D), the allowed density to which the bonus may be applied shall be consistent with both the General Plan category and the zone classification describing the affected property. The applicant is proposing to change the existing zoning from R-2-DP to R-3-30U-DP; the proposed zoning would only permit **53** dwelling units on the subject property. The permitted density of this development would be **53** dwelling units, since it has been standard County procedure and departmental policy to suggest the permitted density be based on the more restrictive of the two.

Pursuant to Section 22.56.202 (Density Bonus Provision) of the Los Angeles County Code, a project which meets the minimum eligibility requirements outlined under this section shall be eligible for a density bonus of at least 25% of the permitted density. Based on this standard, the bonus applies to the permitted density of 53 dwelling units (under zoning). In accordance with the proposed zoning designation of R-3-30U-DP with the 25% density bonus, this project has a permitted project density of **66** dwelling units (including 13 bonus units or 25% density bonus). The proposed development meets the eligibility requirements of Sub-Section 22.56.202-A.3, which requires that at least 50% of the dwelling units are provided for qualifying residents or senior citizens as defined in Section 21.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code. According to Section 22.56.202F, the project is eligible for a density bonus up to 50% over of what the proposed General Plan land use category of High Density Residential would allow since the applicant is reserving at least 74 of the proposed 75 units (with exception of the manager unit) as affordable housing for senior citizens. Thus, the proposed development can have maximum project density of 92 dwelling units or 52.5 dwelling units per acre. The applicant's proposal to develop the subject property with a project density of 42.3 dwelling unit per acre (75 dwelling units) is consistent with the proposed Urban 5 land use category and the R-3-30U-DP zoning designation.

The following table shows the allowable density of the **1.77-acre** subject property under the proposed zoning and land use category with a density bonus CUP:

	Category/Designation	Permitted Density	Density Bonus (25%)	Maximum Allowable Density Bonus of 50% (22.56.202F)
Proposed Zoning	R-3-30U-DP	53 Units	66 Units	N/A
Proposed Land Use	U5 (22.1-35 du/ac)	61 Units	N/A	92 Units

Density Calculation:

Maximum allowable density under the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan
 $1.77 \text{ acres} \times 35 \text{ units/acre (U5)} = 61.95 \text{ or } 61 \text{ units}$

Maximum allowable density under R-3-30-DP zoning
 $1.77 \text{ acres} \times 30 \text{ units/acre} = 53.1 \text{ or } 53 \text{ units}$

Density Bonus Calculation:

25% density bonus (13 bonus units)

$(53 \text{ units} \times 0.25) + 53 \text{ units} = 66 \text{ units (permitted density)}$

Maximum density bonus of 50% over the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan

$(35 \text{ units/acre} \times 0.5) + 35 \text{ (U5)} = 52.5 \text{ units/acre}$

$52.5 \text{ units/acre} \times 1.77 \text{ acres} = 92.9 \text{ or } 92 \text{ units}$

The Hacienda Heights Community General Plan states one of the major housing issues within the community is the lack of broad variety of housing types and prices for all segments of the population. The Plan further states that each community has a responsibility to provide housing for the low income households. The HHCGP's housing element encourages the development of incentives and subsidies for low income housing in the community.

The following excerpts from the Land Use Element of the Countywide General Plan discuss the need to maintain an adequate supply of affordable housing (Page III - 32).

"General Plan policy strongly supports the provision of critically needed low and moderate income housing. In support of this policy emphasis, the Plan proposes the development and application of density bonus and other programs designed to stimulate production of such housing by both the public and private sectors."

Policies Number 1.1 and Number 1.2 of the Housing Element of the General Plan emphasize public agency participation in providing affordable housing.

"Policy No. 1.1: Coordinate with private sector in the development of a variety of affordable and special needs housing for both rental and home ownership. Where appropriate, promote such development by the use of incentives. (Ch 8 Page 3)."

"Policy No. 1.2: Assist private nonprofit housing developers in locating and aggregating suitable sites for developing housing for very low and low-income households and for other special needs groups (Ch 8 Page 4)."

The following excerpt from the Housing Element of the Countywide General Plan discusses the goal to maintain an adequate supply of housing (Ch 8 Page 3).

"A sufficient quantity of housing is needed to service the housing needs of unincorporated area residents. The state legislature recognizes significant housing deficiencies among certain economic segments of California's population, and considers housing availability an issue of 'vital state-wide importance.' The county places particular emphasis on providing housing opportunities to lower-income households and those with special needs such as **senior citizens**, the homeless and those in transitional living situations."

SITE PLAN

Overview

The applicant's site plan, labeled Exhibit "A," depicts the 1.77-acre subject property developed with a two to three story apartment complex comprise of seventy-five (75) rental units. The proposed structure consists of 74 one-bedroom units and 1 two-bedroom unit (manager's unit); and a community room and an office area located on the first floor. The applicant is proposing to provide elevators at the north and south end of the building; and two laundry facilities on each floor of the complex. The required parking is 48 spaces; the applicant is providing 55 uncovered parking spaces (52 standard and 3 handicapped). The parking area is depicted at the rear and along the west side of the subject property. The front yard setback is shown as 20 feet, side yard setbacks as 10 (east) feet and 75 (west) feet, and the rear yard setback as 74 feet. The applicant is proposing extensive landscaping along the front yard and throughout the project site. Access to the development is via a 28-foot driveway from Gale Avenue to the north.

The applicant has submitted elevations of the proposed expansion, labeled Exhibit "A." The elevations depict the proposed building from the south, north, and west. The proposed structure is depicted as 35'-0" above grade. A two-story design element is located at the front and rear portion of the building, approximately 28' and 24', respectively.

Compliance with Applicable Zoning Standards

Section 22.20.320 of the County Code provides that front, side and rear yards shall be provided as required in Zone R-3.

- Front yards shall be not less than 15 feet in depth, interior side yards shall not be less than 5 feet, and rear yards shall not be less than 15 feet in depth.

The proposed building is set back approximately 20'0" from the front (north) property line. The side yard setbacks are depicted as 10'0" (east) and 75'0" (west). The rear yard setback is depicted as 74'0" (south). The applicant's site plan is in compliance with the setback standards of the R-3 Zone and provisions of Chapter 22.48.

- Every building or structure in the R-3 zone shall have a height not to exceed 35 feet above grade.

The proposed building has a height of 35'-0" above finished grade. The applicant's submitted elevations are in compliance with the height limits of the R-3 Zone.

- Section 22.52.1210 of the County Code provides that Multiple-family housing developments that are restricted to senior citizens and handicapped persons shall provide one-half parking space for each dwelling unit, subject to the following restrictions:

1. The parking may be covered or uncovered; if uncovered, the screening requirements of subsection L of Section 22.56.1110 must be followed.

2. A deed restriction, covenant or similar document shall be recorded to assure that the occupants of the units are restricted to senior citizens or handicapped persons.
3. A plot plan shall be submitted to and approved by the director in accordance with Part 12 of Chapter 22.56.
4. Guest parking shall be provided in the ratio of one parking space for each eight units. These spaces shall be marked as guest parking.

The applicant's site plan depicts the 55 parking spaces (52 standard and 3 handicapped). All of the three proposed handicapped spaces are van accessible. The subject property will be screened by a 6-foot high wall along the south, east and west property boundary. The proposed development complies with the County's required parking for a senior citizen apartment.

- ***Sections 22.48.150 and 22.48.160 of the County provides that accessory structures, fences and walls are permitted within the front setback if they do not exceed a height of three and one-half feet.***

Pursuant to Section 22.56.202 of the County Zoning Ordinance, modifications to development standards such as, but not limited to, a reduction in setbacks can be used as incentives or concessions for affordable housing development. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a wall and fence 6-feet in height within the front setback. The wall and fence is necessary to provide security for the residents of the complex. With the exception of the modification for the wall/fence, this project is in compliance with the required yard standards for the proposed R-3-30U-DP zone.

- ***Section 22.30.310 states that property in Zone R-3-()U, developed for any residential use, shall not exceed the number preceding the letter "U" specified in the suffix to the zoning symbol. Such required area per dwelling unit shall not exceed 30 units per net acre.***

The applicant's proposal to develop the 1.77-acre subject property with 75 dwelling units (42.3 du/ac) is consistent with the permitted density of the proposed R-3-30U-DP zone since the applicant is requesting a density bonus (22 bonus units).

BURDEN OF PROOF

Burden of Proof per Code for Conditional Use Permits

Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.56.040 the applicant must meet the burden of proof requirements for a Conditional Use Permit.

6. That the requested use at the location proposed will not:
 - A. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or
 - B. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or

- C. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.
- 7. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.
- 8. That the proposed site is adequately served:
 - A. By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and
 - B. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses

See Attachment A

Section 22.56.202 of the County Zoning Ordinance provides that the applicant shall substantiate the burden of proof for a density bonus conditional use permit as specified by Section 22.56.040 and the following:

- 1. That the proposed project at the location proposed has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area in term of land use patterns, designs and established community character; and**
- 2. That the proposed project will assist in satisfying affordable housing needs, and is viable in terms of continuing availability to meet such housing needs; and**
- 3. That the proposed project shall be reasonably proximate to public transit, shopping and, except for senior citizen housing, employment centers; and**
- 4. That the requested incentives or concessions are required to make the affordable housing units economically feasible.**

The applicant has satisfied the required Burden of Proof findings. A recommended condition of approval will require that the units be reserved for very low and low-income senior citizens for a minimum period of 30 years, pursuant to Section 22.56.202(I). Furthermore, as a condition of approval, the applicant is required to submit a covenant and agreement or such other mechanism subject to review and approval by County Counsel to ensure that the continuing availability of the affordable housing units be implemented and continuously administered for the time period specified.

The proposed project has been reviewed by the Community Development Commission and the applicant has submitted the necessary financial information (**See Attached Exhibit Nos. 1 & 2**). The applicant also included a sample Disposition and Development

Agreement used in a previously approved affordable housing project (**See Attached Exhibit No. 3**).

Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses

See Attachment B

Burden of Proof per Code for Zone Change

Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.16.110, the applicant must meet the burden of proof requirements for a zone change.

- A. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning plan as it pertains to the area or district under consideration;
- B. A need for the proposed zone classification exists within such area or district;
- C. The particular property under consideration is a proper location for said zone classification within such area of district;
- D. Placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice.

Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses

See Attachment C

Burden of proof for General Plan Amendment

The applicant must respond to the mandatory Burden of Proof detailed below for the required General Plan Amendment.

- 1. A need for the proposed General Plan Amendment exists;
- 2. The particular amendment proposed is appropriate and proper;
- 3. Modified condition warrant a revision to the County of Los Angeles General Plan;
- 4. Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices.

Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses

See Attachment D

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The Department of Regional Planning has determined that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental documentation for this project under California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) reporting requirements. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, a Negative Declaration has been recommended.

COUNTY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

The Department of Public Works has provided comments dated May 29 and June 10, 2003 regarding this request; their comments have been included as an attachment to this document (**Attachment E**).

Los Angeles County Fire Department

The Fire Department has provided comments dated June 24, 2003 regarding this request; their comments have been included as attachment to this document (**Attachment F**).

Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

The Department of Health Services has provided comments dated June 17, 2003, regarding this request; their comments have been included as an attachment to document (**Attachment G**).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The applicant has met with the Hacienda Heights Improvement Association (HHIA) to discuss the proposed development and to address any concerns by the community group. A copy of a letter dated May 27, 2003 and August 7, 2003 is attached (**Attachment H**). The HHIA raised issues regarding emergency access for the tenants of the complex, capacity of the existing sewage and water services, and compatibility with adjacent residential development. The letter dated July 21, 2003 is the applicant's response to the HHIA's concerns (**Attachment I**). The Association and the applicant have since resolved and addressed the issues regarding the proposed development, draft Conditions 22 and 23 have been included to ensure compliance. Also, a community meeting was held by the applicant on July 24, 2003 to address any concerns the surrounding residents might have regarding the proposed development. Five adjacent residents attended the meeting and their concerns regarding drainage and design issues regarding the development were addressed by the applicant. The applicant submitted a copy of the notice announcing the community meetings and the attendance record to staff (**Attachment J**). Correspondences have been received from thirteen (13) surrounding residents expressing support of the proposed development (**Attachment K**).

Correspondence dated August 4, 2003 has been received from Sharon Pluth (**Attachment L**). Her correspondence indicates the proposed project should be denied because the project density is too high, the design is out of character to adjacent uses and the traffic impacts were not addressed.

STAFF EVALUATION

The applicant is applying for a density bonus conditional use permit pursuant to Section 22.56.202 of the Los Angeles Code, as the development contains five or more dwelling units and at least 50 percent of the dwelling units are provided for qualifying low income residents or senior citizens as defined in Section 51.2 and 51.3 of the Civil Code. The proposed development has met the minimum requirements as required by subsection A of 22.56.202, therefore, a density bonus of at least 25% shall be granted. The applicant is reserving 74 of the proposed 75 dwelling units (98.6%) for senior citizens as rental housing.

The project is qualified for a bonus of one dwelling unit for each of the additional senior citizen resident unit reserved beyond the minimum required. The Commission can authorize a density bonus up to 50 percent over what the general plan would allow (Subsection F of 22.56.202). The requested to develop the 1.77-acre subject property with

75 dwelling units is 41.5% over the allowable zoning density and 22% over the general plan density.

Conditional Use Permit No. 99-281 approved by the Commission on August 29, 2001 authorized the applicant to develop the subject property with a 48-unit apartment complex for senior citizens. The current proposal for a 75-unit development appears to be more intensive than the entitlement authorized under CUP 98-281; however, the applicant is currently proposing less building coverage, more landscaping and additional building setback. The building will have a two-story element at the front and rear; surrounded by a generous amount of landscaping to ensure privacy for adjacent residences. The proposed development can serve as a buffer between the commercial use along Gale Avenue and the detached single-family residential development to the south and west. The location of the subject property and design of the development is a suitable and desirable infill development. The proposed development will not adversely impact local traffic conditions. Gale Avenue will provide access to the proposed development. Currently, Gale Avenue is a Secondary Highway with a right-of-way width of approximately 80 feet. The subject property is located within a fully developed urbanized area served by sufficient public services and facilities.

The requested density bonus and modifications are necessary to provide identifiable cost reductions and incentives for private sector participation in providing affordable housing. The requested conditional use permit, zone change and local plan amendment will ensure that the development complies with the standards and requirements of the zone and consistent with the policies and criteria of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant has satisfied the required Burden of Proof findings for a Conditional Use Permit, Zone Change and Local Plan Amendment. Therefore, staff concludes that the development as proposed, with the recommended conditions, will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or, be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or, jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

FEES/DEPOSITS

If approved as recommended by staff, the following will apply:

Fish & Game:

- 1. Processing fees of \$1,275.00 related to posting the Notice of Determination with the County Clerk. Fish & Game fees will be required due to the fact that the project will impact natural habitat. The fees will be required prior to the final approval date of the permit.***

Zoning Enforcement:

2. Cost recovery deposit of \$3,000.00 to cover the costs of the thirty (30) recommended annual zoning enforcement inspections. Additional funds would be required if violations are found on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Prior to making a decision on this case, Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the facts, analysis and correspondence contained in this report along with the oral testimony and/or written comments received during the public hearing.

Staff recommends that the Regional Planning Commission approve Local Plan Amendment No. 03-113-(4), Zone Change No. 03-113-(4) and Conditional Use Permit No. 03-113-(4), if the Regional Planning Commission determines that the applicant has met the required Burden of Proof and that the proposed amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan and the change of zone can be consistent with applicable provisions and criteria of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

SUGGESTED MOTION

"I MOVE THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED AND THAT THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION INDICATE ITS INTENT TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ZONE CHANGE NO. 03-113-(4), A CHANGE OF ZONE FROM R-2-DP TO R-3-30U-DP, AND LOCAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-113-(4), AN AMENDMENT OF LAND USE CATEGORY FROM URBAN 4 TO URBAN 5, AND INDICATE ITS INTENT TO APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 03-113-(4), AND INSTRUCT STAFF TO PREPARE THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION AND FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL."

Report prepared by Samuel Dea, Principal Regional Planning Assistant II
Reviewed by Russell Fricano, Supervising Regional Planner Zoning Permits I Section

Attachments:

Copy of Thomas Brothers Map
Draft Conditions
Burden of Proof (Attachment A-D)
DPW Comments
Fire Department Comments
Health Services Comments
Attachments & Exhibits (E-L)

RJF:SD

STAFF USE ONLYPROJECT NUMBER: 03-113CASES: CUP, ZC, LPA

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *****COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING****GENERAL INFORMATION****I.A. Map Date:** 04/16/03 **Staff Member:** Roxanne Tanemori**Thomas Guide:** 678 B-2 **USGS Quad:** La Habra**Location:** 15554 Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, CA 91745

Description of Project: The proposed project is a request for a Zone Change from R-2 DP (Two Family Residence, Development Program) to R-3 DP (Limited Multiple Residence, Development Program), a Local Plan Amendment from U-4 (up to 22 units/acre) to U-5 (up to 35 units/acre), and a Conditional Use Permit for a Housing Density Bonus in order to allow for the construction of a seventy-five (75) unit affordable housing apartment complex for very low and low income senior citizens. There will be seventy-four (74) one-bedroom senior apartments, one (1) two-bedroom manager's apartment, and a community room/club house. The apartment building will be two- and three- stories (not exceeding 35-feet in height). A six- foot concrete block wall will border the site except on the north property line. There will be a total of fifty-five (55) parking spaces provided at grade level.

Gross Acres: 1.77 acres

Environmental Setting: The subject property is located in a mixed-use neighborhood in the unincorporated community of Hacienda Height directly south of the boundary of the City of Industry, east of Farmstead Avenue and west of Dunswell Avenue. Land uses within 500-feet of the subject property include a shopping center and other commercial uses (C-2 BE zone), industrial/warehouse distribution centers (City of Industry), and single-family residences (A-1-6,000).

Zoning: R-2 DP: Two Family Residence, Development Program**General Plan:** 1: Low Density Residential**Community/Area wide Plan:** U-4: Medium Density Residential (12.1 – 22.0 units/acre)

Hacienda Heights Community General Plan

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
<u>99-281 (same lot)</u>	<u>Zone Change from C-2-BE & A-1-6,000 to R-2-DP-BE; Adopted 09/03/02</u>
	<u>Local Plan Amendment from C and U-2 to U-4; Adopted 05/28/02</u>
	<u>48-unit senior apartment complex; Approved 09/03/02 (never constructed)</u>
<u>01-269</u>	<u>62-unit motel; Approved 10/16/02</u>
<u>98-056</u>	<u>Expansion of existing church; Approved 03/09/99</u>
<u>03-081 / TR</u>	
<u>54367</u>	<u>10 single-family residential lots; Pending</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies	Special Reviewing Agencies	<u>Regional Significance</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area
<input type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>City of Industry</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Hacienda Heights Improvement Association</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trustee Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	County Reviewing Agencies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <i>Land Development Div., Watershed Management Div., Geotech. & Mat.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/>	

		<i>Engineering Div., Traffic & Lighting Div.</i>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Services: <i>Environmental Hygiene Program</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				Potential Concern
<u>HAZARDS</u>	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Liquefaction Zone, Near Whittier Heights and Walnut Creek Faults</u>
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Near a light industrial area</u>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>NPDES/SUSMP compliance required</u>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map

2: Conservation/Maintenance

- Designation: _____
2. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of
printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the _____ environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will _____ reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT***, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Roxanne Tanemori Date: June 10, 2003

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <i>Seismic Hazards Zone: Liquefaction, Baldwin Park USGS Quad; approximately 1 mile from Whittier Heights and Walnut Creek Faults, Safety Element Plate 1: Fault Rupture Hazards & Historic Seismicity</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <i>Seismic Hazards Zone: Liquefaction, Baldwin Park USGS Quad</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Department of Public Works concluded there are no significant geotechnical impacts. A liquefaction analysis

done to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works will be required at the grading/building plan

stages; please see Department of Public Works correspondence dated May 29, 2003 for more information.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No Impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Applicant shall submit to the Department of Public Works for review and approval a Grading/Standard Urban

Stormwater Mitigation Plan prior to issuance of building permit. See DPW correspondence dated June 10,

2003 for more information regarding specific requirements.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
<i>Additional Area of High Fire Hazard, Safety Element Plate 7:
Wildland & Urban Fire Hazard</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? |

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

No comments from Los Angeles County Fire Department were received during the consultation period.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

- ☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? |

Light industrial area near apartments for senior citizens

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Department of Health Services—Environmental Health—Environmental Hygiene concluded there would be no

significant noise impacts associated with the proposed project. See DHS correspondence dated June 17, 2003.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>NPDES/SUSMP compliance required</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>NPDES/SUSMP compliance required</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW) |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Design | <input type="checkbox"/> Compatible Use |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|

Applicant shall comply with all requirements set forth by County Department of Public Works—Watershed

Management Division in correspondence dated May 29, 2003. No comments were received from the California

Regional Water Quality Control Board.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	<u>Yes</u>	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size
Permit

☐ Project Design

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

☐ Oak Tree

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Visual Report

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? <u>75 units are proposed in an area with known congestion problems.</u>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Department of Public Works—Traffic & Lighting Division concluded there would be no significant impacts to

County roadways as a result of the proposed project. See DPW correspondence dated May 29, 2003 for more

information.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?</p> <p><i>Less than one mile to nearest fire station located in the City of Industry.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?</p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? |

e. ☐ ☒ ☐

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?</p> <p><i>A Local Plan Amendment to the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan is</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>being requested with this application. Current: U-4 (up to 22 units/acre), proposed:</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>U-5 (up to 35 units/acre). A Density Bonus has also been requested to allow for the</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>construction of 75 units.</i></p> <hr/>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?</p> <p><i>A Zone Change is being requested with this application. Current: R-2 DP (Two</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Family Residence, Development Program), proposed: R-3 DP (Limited Multiple</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Residence, Development Program).</i></p> <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project physically divide an established community?</p> <hr/>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <hr/>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or

cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or

cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than